



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,324	11/27/2000	Tomy K. Isaac	00-40323-US	5536

7066 7590 02/04/2004

REED SMITH LLP  
2500 ONE LIBERTY PLACE  
1650 MARKET STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
----------

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/723,324

Applicant(s)

ISAAC ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because they are not presentable. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action

to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inala (US006199077B1) and in view of Grampper et al. (US006442601B1).

5. With regard to *claims 29, 1, 54 and 76*, Inala reference discloses,

- *extracting organizational information (data) from at least two service providers (individual ones of Internet sites) to form at least two organizational information protocols, wherein one organizational information protocol (agent dedicated to each site accessed) corresponds to each of the at least two service providers; (Inala, col.9, lines 30-36, lines 42-45; col.18, lines 11-15; module 64 on fig.3)*
- *providing a migration selection interface (individualized/personalized Web page, personalized portal page) to a user; (Inala, col.2, lines 24-30; col.4, lines 29-32, lines 51-58; col.5, lines 4-21; fig.2; module 57 on fig.3)*
- *accessing a first at least one of the at least two service providers upon selection of the migration selection interface by the user; (Inala, col.4,*

lines 55-58; col.4, line 62 – col.5, line 1; col.5, lines 29-32; col.17, lines 18-19; col.18, lines 11-15; module 58 on fig.3)

- *receiving, according to the organizational information protocol correspondent to the first at least one of the at least two service providers, of a first plurality of information related to the user, upon said accessing a first at least one of the at least two service providers; (Inala, col.10, line 66 – col.11, line 3; col.16, lines 22-27, lines 47-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)*
- *normalizing the first plurality of information into a standard format; (Inala, col.12, lines 35-45; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)*

However, Inala reference does not explicitly disclose,

- *accessing a second at least one of the at least two service providers upon selection of the migration selection interface by the user;*
- *denormalizing the normalized first plurality of information into a second plurality of information;*
- *writing the second plurality of information to the second at least one of the at least two service providers according to the organizational information protocol correspondent to the second at least one of the at least two service providers.*

Grampper teaches,

- *accessing a second at least one of the at least two service providers upon selection of the migration selection interface by the user; (Inala, col.2, lines 21-24, lines 36-46, lines 47-64; col.3, lines 9-22; fig.1)*
- *denormalizing the normalized first plurality of information into a second plurality of information; (Inala, col.2, lines 21-24, lines 36-46, lines 47-64; col.3, lines 9-22; fig.1)*
- *writing the second plurality of information to the second at least one of the at least two service providers according to the organizational information protocol correspondent to the second at least one of the at least two service providers. (Inala, col.2, lines 21-24, lines 36-46, lines 47-64; col.3, lines 9-22; fig.1)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Grampper reference with Inala reference to enable the provider to improve network bandwidth conservation by transferring or migrating information from one source (i.e. service provider) to another which may offer faster access to the information or higher availability of bandwidth.

6. With regard to *claims 31-34, 1-5 and 55-58*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein the at least two service providers provide services in a service provision area. (Inala, col.1, lines 35-38; col.5, lines 8-18)*
  - *wherein the service provision area is at least one selected from banking and financial services, email services, on line calendar and address book services, mysite.com pages, bill payment services, and application service providers. (Inala, col.1, lines 35-38; col.5, lines 8-18)*
  - *wherein the banking and financial services are at least one selected from the group consisting of payment of a mortgage, a loan, a balance transfer, account balances, filling out of forms, credit checks, digital signal encryption, and login and password information. (Inala, col.1, lines 35-38; col.5, lines 8-18)*
  - *wherein the mysite.com site is at least one selected from the group consisting of an ISP site, a wireless customization site, a shopping site, and an online trading site. (Inala, col.1, lines 35-38; col.5, lines 8-18)*
7. With regard to *claims 35-39, 45-46, 6-13, 59-63 and 69*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,
- See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.
- Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,
- *wherein the organizational information protocol includes a format and a location for the first plurality of information. (Inala, col.11, lines 36-55; col.12, lines 35-45; col.13, line 55 – col.14, line 2; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)*

- *further comprising, upon said extracting, formatting the organizational information protocol for each service provider into an organizational information database organized by service provider. (Inala, col.11, lines 36-55; col.12, lines 35-45; col.13, line 55 – col.14, line 2; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)*
- *wherein the organizational information protocol represents a manner of organization of the at least one service provider, information entry methods for the at least one service provider, and information extraction methods for the at least one service provider (Inala, col.11, lines 36-55; col.12, lines 35-45; col.13, line 55 – col.14, line 2; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)*

8. With regard to *claims 40, 15 and 64*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein said accessing a first at least one service provider comprises entering a user name and password. (Inala, col.2, lines 24-30, lines 47-52; col.4, lines 29-32, lines 51-58; col.10, lines 2-3, lines 11-15; col.12, lines 6-12; col.16, lines 22-23, lines 51-59; fig.2; module 105 on fig.5)*

9. With regard to *claims 41-44, 16-20 and 65-68*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.



Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein said normalizing is performed by an import coordinating service.*  
(Inala, col.9, lines 53-63; col.12, lines 35-45, lines 46-58; col.13, lines 43-54; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 22-27, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)
- *wherein said normalizing comprises sending, by the import coordinating service, of control messages, which control messages receive the first plurality of information according to the organizational information protocol.* (Inala, col.9, lines 53-63; col.12, lines 35-45, lines 46-58; col.13, lines 43-54; col.14, lines 21-29; col.16, lines 22-27, lines 43-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)

10. With regard to *claims 47-48, 21-22 and 70*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein the first plurality of information includes personal information data and errors that occurred during said receiving of a first plurality.* (Inala, col.7, lines 46-61; col.8, lines 5-12; col.10, line 66 – col.11, line 3; col.13, lines 55-67; col.16, lines 22-27, lines 47-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)
- *wherein the errors include information requested by said receiving that could not be located and information requested by said receiving that was not formatted according to the organizational information protocol.* (Inala,

col.7, lines 46-61; col.8, lines 5-12; col.10, line 66 – col.11, line 3; col.13, lines 55-67; col.16, lines 22-27, lines 47-50; modules 119, 121 on fig.5)

11. With regard to *claim 14*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein the migration selection interface comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a clickable icon, a button, a tile, an authorization box, an entry of a name, an entry of a password, an entry of personal information, and an entry of credit card information. (Inala, col.2, lines 24-30; col.4, lines 29-32, lines 51-58; col.5, lines 4-21; fig.2; module 57 on fig.3)*

12. With regard to *claims 49, 23-24 and 71*, Inala reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Inala reference discloses,

- *wherein said denormalizing comprises sending export control messages that map the second plurality of information into a proper location on the second at least one service provider. (Inala, col.2, lines 21-24, lines 36-46, lines 47-64; col.3, lines 9-22; fig.1)*

Art Unit: 2143

13. With regard to *claims 77-82*, they include features or limitations as in *claim 34*.

Thus, *claims 77-82* are also rejected under the same rational as cited in the rejection of the *claim 34* (see *claim 34* rejection as detailed above).

14. *Claims 50-53, 25-28 and 72-75* are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inala et al. (US006199077B1), in view of Grampper et al. (US006442601B1) and further in view of Burson et al. (US006405245B1).

15. With regard to *claims 7-9, 14, 17-18, 75-77, 82 and 85-86*, Inala and Grampper references disclose,

See *claims 29, 1 and 54* rejection as detailed above.

However, Inala and Grampper references do not explicitly disclose,

- *further comprising billing the second at least one service provider for the user migrated to the second at least one service provider.*
- *further comprising billing the user for the user migrated to the second at least one service provider.*

Burson teaches,

- *further comprising billing the second at least one service provider for the user migrated to the second at least one service provider. (Burson, col.14, lines 34-48; fig.11)*
- *further comprising billing the user for the user migrated to the second at least one service provider (Burson, col.14, lines 34-48; fig.11)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Burson reference with Inala and Grampper references to recover for the cost of providing a service to the client as well as the new service provider.

### ***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Wu et al. (US006510451B2)
- Satyavolu et al. (US006517587B2)
- Rangan et al. (US006412073B1)
- Anuff et al. (US006327628B1)
- Kumar et al. (US006278993B1)

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 703/305-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

are 703/872-9306 for regular communications and 703/872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

*Thomas Duong (AU2143)*

*January 26, 2004*



**DAVID WILEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**